



Japanese Sluicing as a Specificational Pseudo-cleft*

Chizuru Nakao and Masaya Yoshida
(University of Maryland, College Park)

1. Introduction

- (1) Goal of this study
To consider the nature of *Pronominal Sluicing* in Japanese.
- (2) English Sluicing
IP-ellipsis follows overt wh-movement (Merchant, 2001, among others)
- (3) John met someone, but I don't know [_{CP} who₁ [_{IP} John met t₁]].
- (4) Japanese Sluicing
 - a. *Japanese Standard Sluicing*
John-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa dare-ni
John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top who-Dat
(da)ka sira-nai.
(be)Q know-not
"John met someone, but I don't know who."
 - b. *Japanese Pronominal Sluicing*
John-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa sore-ga
John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top it-Nom
dare-ni (da) ka sira-nai.
who-Dat (be) Q know-not
"John met someone, but I don't know who (it is)."
- (5) Previous studies treated two types of Japanese Sluicing uniformly.
(Section 3)

* We are grateful to the following people for the valuable comments and encouragement: Ivano Caponigro, Tomo Fujii, Takuya Goro, Norbert Hornstein, Koji Hoshi, Howard Lasnik, Jason Merchant, Phil Monahan, Miki Obata, Hajime Ono, Hiromu Sakai, Tetsuya Sano, Eri Takahashi, Asako Uchibori, and Akira Watanabe. This research is supported by grants to Colin Phillips from NSF grant #BCS-0196004 and Human Frontiers grant #RGY01342001.

- (6) This study
- a. Japanese Pronominal Sluicing must be distinguished from Japanese Standard Sluicing.
 - b. Pronominal Sluicing is an elliptical specificational pseudo-cleft.
 - c. *Sore* in Pronominal Sluicing is a residue of D whose complement CP is deleted.

2. Properties of Pronominal Sluicing

- (7) Differences
- a. Pronominal Sluicing shows a reconstruction effect but Japanese Standard Sluicing does not. ((8))
 - b. Scrambling out of Pronominal Sluicing is not allowed but scrambling out of Japanese Standard Sluicing is possible. (Takahashi, 2004; (9))
- (8) Reconstruction effect
- John₁-ga dareka-o seme-ta ga, watasi-wa *(sore-ga)
John-Nom someone-Acc blame-past but I-Top (it-Nom)
zibun-zisin₁-o kadooka sira-nai.
self-self-Acc whether know-not
“John₁ blamed someone, but I don’t know whether it is himself₁.”
- (9) Scrambling (Takahashi, 2004)
- John-wa [dono gakusei-ga Smith sensei-ni at-ta ka]
John-Top which student-Nom Smith prof.-Dat meet-past Q
sitteiru ga, [Brown sensei-ni-wa (*sore-ga) dono
know but Brown prof.-Dat-Top (it-Nom) which
gakusei-ga ka] sira-nai.
student-Nom Q know-not
“John knows which student met Prof. Smith, but (he) doesn’t know Prof. Brown, which student (it is).”
- (10) A problem
- Previous analyses cannot distinguish Pronominal Sluicing from Japanese Standard Sluicing.

3. Previous Studies

3.1. Two analyses of Japanese Sluicing

- (11) Two analyses of Japanese Sluicing
- a. Takahashi, 1993, 1994: The *wh*-movement + IP-ellipsis analysis ((12))
 - b. Kizu, 1997, 1999; Kuwabara, 1997, among others: The cleft analysis ((13))
- (12) The *wh*-movement + IP-ellipsis analysis
 watasi-wa [_{CP} dare₁-ni [_{IP} ~~John-ga t_i-at-ta~~]] ka sira-nai
I-Top who-Dat John-Nom meet-past Q know-not
 “I don’t know who John met.”
- (13) The cleft analysis
- a. John-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa **sore-ga**
John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top it-Nom
 dare-ni (da) ka sira-nai.
who-Dat (be) Q know-not
 “John met someone, but I don’t know who (it is).”
 - b. watasi-wa [_{CP} [_{IP} John-ga t₁-at-ta] **no**]-ga
I-Top John-Nom meet-past C_{nominalizer}-Nom
 [dare₁-ni (da)] ka] sira-nai.
who-Dat (be) Q know-not
 “I don’t know who it was that John met.”
- (14) The fragment *who* in (13a) corresponds to the pivot in its cleft counterpart (13b).

3.2. Argument for the cleft analysis

(15) Argument for Cleft Analysis

- a. The position for the copula (16a)
- b. The position for *sore* (16b)
- c. Lack of animacy agreement (19)

- (16) a. The configuration in (12) is incompatible with the optional existence of the copula.

Under the cleft analysis, the copula originally exists in the underlying structure in (13b). (Merchant, 1998, 2001)

- b. The configuration in (12) cannot accommodate the pronoun *sore* ‘it’ in Pronominal Sluicing.

Under the cleft analysis, the pronoun “replaces” the presupposition clause of the cleft (Kuwabara, 1997).

- (17) A potential problem with Cleft Analysis

The specific mechanism of “replacement” is not clear in previous studies.

- (18) a. The source of the pronoun in Pronominal Sluicing cannot be the indefinite expression that it apparently refers to (ex. ‘someone’ in (19a)). It is different from normal coreferential pronouns.

- b. It is compatible with the assumption that *sore* has clausal status.

- (19) Lack of animacy agreement

- a. John-ga **dareka-ni** at-ta ga, watasi-wa **sore-ga**
John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top it-Nom
 dare-ni (da) ka sira-nai.
who-Dat (be) Q know-not

“John met someone, but I don’t know who (it is).”

- b. John-ga dareka-ni at-te,
John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past
 *sore-ni/sono hito-ni hanasikake-ta.
it-Dat/ the person-Dat talk-to-past

“John met someone, and talked to *it/the person.”

4. Proposals

4.1. Pronominal Sluicing as a specificational pseudo-cleft

- (20) Pronominal Sluicing is a specificational pseudo-cleft rather than a (simple) cleft construction.
- (21) Two types of focus constructions
- a. *Cleft*
It is a book that John bought.
 - b. *Pseudo-cleft*
What John bought is a book.
- (22) Specificational and predicational pseudo-cleft
What John left was the dog's food.
- a. *Specificational*: John was supposed to eat the dog's food, but he left it.
 - b. *Predicational*: Whatever John left was for the dog to eat.
(Akmajian, 1970; den Dikken, 2001; Higgins, 1979)
- (23)
- a. *Specificational*: Identify “what John left”
 - b. *Predicational*: Describe “what John left”

4.2. Diagnosing specificational pseudo-cleft

- | | | |
|------|--|------|
| (24) | Diagnoses for specificational pseudo-cleft | |
| | a. Reconstruction effects | (25) |
| | b. Agreement with the pre-copular element | (26) |
| | c. Incompatibility with negation | (27) |
- (25) Reconstruction effects
- a. What John₁ treasures most is a book about himself₁/*him₁.
(Specificational)
 - b. What John₁ treasures most is a book about *himself₁/him₁.
(Predicational)
- (26) Agreement with the pre-copular element
- a. What you have bought **is/*are** fake jewels. (Specificational)
 - b. What you have bought ***is/are** fake jewels. (Predicational)
- (27) Incompatibility with negation
- a. *What John₁ is isn't important to himself₁. (Specificational)
 - b. What John₁ is isn't important to him₁. (Predicational)
- (28) Simple cleft shares the properties (24a) and (24b) with specificational, but not (24c).
- a. *Reconstruction effects*
It is himself₁ that John₁ blamed.
 - b. *Agreement with the pre-copular element*
It is/*they are fake jewels that John bought.
 - c. *Possibility of negation*
It is not himself₁ that John₁ blamed.

4.3. Pronominal Sluicing as a specificational pseudo-cleft

4.3.1. Japanese (pseudo-)cleft

(29) Japanese cleft and pseudo-cleft are superficially indistinguishable.

[John-ga kat-ta no]-wa hon-o da.
John-Nom buy-past C_{nominalizer}-Top book-Acc be

“It is a book that John bought./ What John bought is a book.”

(30) Specificational/ Predicational distinction

a. (pseudo-) cleft without a Case marker

John-ga nokosi-ta no-wa inu-no esa da.
John-Nom leave-past C-Top dog-Gen food be

“It is dog’s food that John left./What John left is dog’s food.”

(Specificational/Predicational)

b. (pseudo-) cleft with a Case marker

John-ga nokosi-ta no-wa inu-no esa-o da.
John-Nom leave-past C-Top dog-Gen food-Acc be

(Specificational/*Predicational)

4.3.2. Parallelism

(31) Specific meaning

a. John-ga **dareka-ni** at-ta ga, watasi-wa **sore-ga**
John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top it-Nom
dare-ni (da) ka sira-nai.
who-Dat (be) Q know-not

“John met someone, but I don’t know who (it is).”

b. Pronominal Sluicing identifies who the “someone” in the first conjunct is, rather than describes the property that whoever John met would have.

(32) Case marking

a. John-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa sore-ga
John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top it-Nom
dare-ni (da) ka sira-nai.
who-Dat (be) Q know-not

“John met someone, but I don’t know who (it is).”

b. The fragment wh-phrase in Pronominal Sluicing can be Case-marked.
(cf. (30))

(33) Reconstruction effect: The fragmental anaphor is reconstructed to the trace position in Pronominal Sluicing.

- a. John₁-ga dareka-o seme-ta ga, watasi-wa
John-Nom someone-Acc blame-past but I-Top
 sore-ga **zibun-zisin**₁-o kadooka sira-nai. (= (8))
it-Nom self-self-Acc whether know-not
 “John₁ blamed someone, but I don’t know whether it is himself₁.”
- b. watasi-wa [_{DP} sore [~~{John₁-ga t_i seme-ta}~~no]]-ga
I-Top it John-Nom blame-past C-Nom
 zibun-zisin₁-o kadooka sira-nai
self-self-Acc whether know-not

(34) Agreement with the pre-copular element

- a. ?John-ga aru kata-ni oaisi-ta ga,
John-Nom certain person-Dat meet(Obj.Hon)-past but,
 watasi-wa **sore-ga** dare₁-ni deirassyat-ta ka
I-Top it-Nom who-Dat be(Subj.Hon)-past Q
 sira-nai.
know-not
 “John met(Obj.Hon) a certain person, but I don’t know who it is(Subj.Hon).”
- b. Watasi-wa [_{CP} [~~{John-ga t_i oaisi-ta}~~no]]-ga dare₁-ni
I-Top John-Nom meet(Obj.Hon) C-Nom who-Dat
 deirassyat-ta ka sira-nai.
be(Subj.Hon)-past Q know-not
 “I don’t know who it is(Subj.Hon) that John met(Obj.Hon).”

(35) a. The focused element *dare* is not an honorificational expression.
 b. The subject clause is honorified by the existence of the object honorificational verb and agrees with the honorificational copula.
 (See Boeckx & Niinuma, 2003, for discussion of honorification as an agreement phenomenon.)

(36) Incompatibility with negation

- *John₁-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa sore-ga
John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top it-Nom
 zibun₁-no hahaoya-ni **de-nai** kadooka sira-nai.
self-Gen mother-Dat be-not whether know-not
 “John₁ met someone, but I don’t know whether it is **not** self₁’s mother.”

(37) Another similarity between Japanese (pseudo-)cleft and Pronominal Sluicing: Unavailability of inversion

(38) (Pseudo-)cleft

- a. [[John-ga kat-ta] no]-wa/ga hon(-o) da.
John-Nom buy-past C-Top/Nom book-Acc be
“What John bought is a book.”
- b. *Hon-wa/ga [[John-ga kat-ta] no] da
Book-Top/Nom John-Nom buy-past C be
“A book is what John bought.”

(39) Pronominal Sluicing

- a. John-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa **sore-ga**
John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top it-Nom
dare-ni (da) ka sira-nai.
who-Dat (be) Q know-not
“John met someone, but I don’t know who (it is).”
- b. *John-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa dare-ga
John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top who-Nom
sore (da) ka sira-nai.
it (be) Q know-not

4.3.3. Analysis

- (40) *Sore* as a residue of D
Sore in Pronominal Sluicing is a residue of D whose complement CP is deleted.
- (41) A puzzle: the dual nature of *sore*
 a. *Sore* in Pronominal Sluicing holds the status of DP:
 The form of pronoun, Nominative Case-marking
 b. *Sore* in Pronominal Sluicing also has a clausal status:
 Correspondence to the clausal subject of specificational pseudo-cleft
- (42) The structure
 watasi-wa [_{DP} **sore** [_{CP} [_{IP} ~~John-ga t₁ at-ta~~] ~~no~~] D]-ga
 I-Top **it** **John-Nom** **meet-past** **C** -Nom
 dare₁-ni (da) ka sira-nai.
 who-Dat (be) Q know-not
- (43) a. The definite article D takes some clausal complement headed by the nominalizer *no*.
 b. *Sore* is a morphological realization of the definite determiner.
 (cf. Kuroda's (1999) analysis of adverbial clauses followed by *sore*)
- (44) Deletion under identity
 a. John-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa sore-ga
 John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top it-Nom
 dare-**ni** (da) ka sira-nai.
 who-**Dat** (be) Q know-not
 “John met someone, but I don’t know who (it is).”
 b. [_{IP} Dareka₂-ni [_{IP} **John-ga t₂ at-ta**]] ga, (after QR)
 someone-Dat John-Nom meet-past but
 watasi-wa [_{DP} **sore** [_{CP} [_{IP} ~~John-ga t₁ at-ta~~] ~~no~~] D]-ga
 I-Top **it** **John-Nom** **meet-past** **C** -Nom
 dare₁-ni (da) ka sira-nai.
 who-Dat (be) Q know-not
- (45) After the QR of the indefinite, the first conjunct of Pronominal Sluicing has the identical construction to that of the presupposition clause in the second conjunct (Nakao, 2003).

- (46) The speculation of the mechanism
Sore is derived from the demonstrative *sono* in (47).
- (47) The structure
 [_{DP} sono [John-ga t at-ta no]]
the John-Nom meet-past C_{nominalizer}/thing
 “*lit.* the thing that John met” “*meaning.* the person that John met”
- (48) The demonstrative in [Spec, DP] and the definite D head are transformed into the pronoun *sore* by some morphophonological requirement.
- (49) Elbourne's (2001) analysis of e-type pronouns
 E-type pronoun is a residue of D whose complement NP is deleted.
- (50) a. Every man who owns a donkey beats [_{DP} it [_{NP} donkey]]
 b. Every man who owns a donkey beats [_{DP} the [_{NP} donkey]]
- (51) The pronoun *it* as D whose complement NP undergoes deletion.
- (52) Similarity between *sore* in Pronominal Sluicing and e-type pronouns
- (53) a. The denotation of the pronoun covaries with a non-c-commanding antecedent.
 b. John-ga itumo tigau hito-ni au ga,
John-Nom always different person-Dat meet but
watasi-wa itumo sore-ga dare-ni ka sira-nai.
I-Top always it-Nom who-Dat Q know-not
 “John always meets a different person, but I always don’t know who it is.”

4.3.4. Properties explained

(54) Differences between Pronominal Sluicing and Standard Sluicing (Section 2)

- a. Reconstruction effect (55)
- b. Scrambling (56)

(55) Reconstruction effect

John₁-ga dareka-o seme-ta ga, watasi-wa *(sore-ga)
John-Nom someone-Acc blame-past but I-Top (it-Nom)

zibun-zisin₁-o kadooka sira-nai.

self-self-Acc whether know-not

“John₁ blamed someone, but I don’t know whether it is himself₁.”

(56) Scrambling

John-wa [dono gakusei-ga Smith sensei-ni at-ta ka]
John-Top which student-Nom Smith prof.-Dat meet-past Q

sitteiru ga [Brown sensei-ni-wa (*sore-ga) dono
know but Brown prof.-Dat-Top (it-Nom) which

gakusei-ga ka] sira-nai.

student-Nom Q know-not

“John knows which student met Prof. Smith, but (he) doesn’t know Prof. Brown, which student (it is).”

- (57) a. Reconstruction effect is derived if Pronominal Sluicing is specificational pseudo-cleft.
- b. Impossibility of scrambling is derived from the ban against scrambling out of definite DPs (below).

(58) Ban against scrambling out of definite DPs

a. [_{DP} (sono) [_{CP} Mary-ga John-ni t₁ syookaisi-ta] hito₁]
(the) Mary-Nom John-Dat introduce-past person

“The person who Mary introduced John”

b. * [_{DP} John₁-ni [_{DP} sono [_{CP} Mary-ga t₂ t₁ syookaisi-ta]
John-Dat the Mary-Nom introduce-past
hito₁]]
person

c. [_{DP} John₁-ni [_{DP} [_{CP} Mary-ga t₂ t₁ syookaisi-ta] hito₁]]
John-Dat Mary-Nom introduce-past person

d. [_{DP} [_{CP} John₁-ni [_{CP} Mary-ga t₂ t₁ syookaisi-ta] hito₁]]
John-Dat Mary-Nom introduce-past person

5. Remaining Problems

- (59) Remaining problems
- a. Structure of Japanese Standard Sluicing
 - b. Structure of Japanese Standard Sluicing/Pronominal Sluicing without Case markers
 - c. Generality of CP-deletion approach
- (60) What is the structure of Japanese Standard Sluicing?
- a. No reconstruction effect: no reconstruction site
 - b. Possibility of scrambling: no definite D head
- (61) What is the structure of Standard Sluicing/Pronominal Sluicing without Case markers? (Fukaya & Hoji, 1999; Hiraiwa & Ishihara, 2002; Hoji, 1990)
- (62) Non-Case-marked Standard Sluicing/Pronominal Sluicing
John-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa (sore-ga) **dare**
John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top (it-Nom) who
(da) ka sira-nai.
(be) Q know-not
“John met someone, but I don’t know who (it is).”
- (63) Non-Case-marked cleft does not show the properties of movement.
“Aboutness” licensing is possible. (Hoji, 1990)
- (64) How general is the “pronouns as deletion” approach applicable to other constructions/languages?
- (65) Similar approaches
- a. Kuroda's (1999) analysis of adverbial clauses
 - b. Elbourne's (2001) analysis of e-type pronouns

6. Conclusion

- (66) Our Conclusion
- a. Japanese Pronominal Sluicing is a different construction from Japanese Standard Sluicing.
 - b. Japanese Pronominal Sluicing has an underlying structure of specificational pseudo-cleft.
 - c. *Sore* in Japanese Pronominal Sluicing is a residue of D whose complement CP undergoes deletion.

References

- Akmajian, A. (1970). *Aspects of Grammar of Focus in English*, Ph. D. Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Boeckx, C., and Niinuma, F. (2003). Conditions on Agreement in Japanese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22:453 - 480.
- den Dikken, M. (2001). Specificational Copular Sentences and Pseudoclefts. *ms. City University of New York*.
- Elbourne, P. (2001). E-type Anaphora as NP-deletion. *Natural Language Semantics* 9:241-288.
- Fukaya, T., and Hoji, H. (1999). Stripping and sluicing in Japanese and some implications. *Proceedings of West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* 18.
- Higgins, F. R. (1979). *The Pseudo-Cleft Construction in English*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Hiraiwa, K., and Ishihara, S. (2002). Missing Links: Clefts, Sluicing, and "No da" Construction in Japanese. In *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 43: Proceedings of HUMIT 2001*, eds. Ionin, T., H. Ko and A. Nevins, 35-54. Massachusetts, Cambridge MA: MITWPL.
- Hoji, H. (1990). *Theory of Anaphora and Aspects of Japanese Syntax*: ms. University of Southern California.
- Kizu, M. (1997). Sluicing in Wh-in-situ Languages. *Proceedings of the Thirty-third Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*:231-244.
- Kizu, M. (1999). *Unbounded Dependencies in Cleft Constructions*.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1999). Syuyoobunaizaigata Kankeisetu [Head Internal Relative Clauses]. In *Kotoba no Kaku to Syuuen [Core and Periphery of Language]*, eds. Kuroda, S.-Y. and M. Nakamura. Tokyo: Kurosio Publisher.
- Kuwabara, K. (1997). On the properties of truncated clauses in Japanese. *Report (1) Researching and Verifying an Advanced Theory of Human Language*:61-

84.

- Merchant, J. (1998). "Pseudosluicing": Elliptical Clefts in Japanese and English. In *ZAS Working Papers in Linguistics*, eds. Alexiadou, A., N. Fuhrhop, P. Law and U. Kleinhenz, 88-112. Berlin: Zentrum Für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft.
- Merchant, J. (2001). *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and the Theory of Ellipsis*: Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nakao, C. (2003). Japanese Pseudo-Sluicing and Quantifier Raising. *Linguistic Research* 20:193-206.
- Takahashi, D. (1993). Movement of Wh-phrases in Japanese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11:655-678.
- Takahashi, D. (1994). Sluicing in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3:265-300.
- Takahashi, D. (2004). Extraction Out of Nothing. *Paper presented at Sendai Area Circle of Linguistics (SACL) 2004*.

Chizuru Nakao
University of Maryland, College Park
cnakao@umd.edu

Masaya Yoshida
University of Maryland, College Park
masaya@wam.umd.edu